

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. In the final Office Action of July 2, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bianco, et al.* (U.S. 6,256,737) (“*Bianco*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner’s disposition below. Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner previously allowed the present claims over *Bianco* in the Office Action dated 5/21/2007. However, in the present Office Action of July 2, 2008, the Examiner alleges that the present claims are again rejected in light of *Bianco*. Applicants respectfully submit the present claims are allowable over *Bianco* as discussed below.

Claims 1, 12, 22, and 27 each claim subject matter relating to an information processing apparatus that outputs a request for issuing a person identification certificate to a person identification certificate authority, when the information processing apparatus determines that the person identification certificate has not been received from the person identification certificate authority and stored locally in a local storage device of the information processing apparatus.

Thus, the information processing apparatus determines whether the person identification certificate has been received from the person identification certificate authority and stored locally in a local storage device of the information processing apparatus. If the information processing apparatus determines that the certificate has not been received and stored locally, then it outputs a request for issuing a person identification certificate to the person identification certificate authority.

This is clearly unlike *Bianco*, which fails to disclose or suggest an information processing apparatus that determines whether a person identification certificate has been received from a person identification certificate authority and stored locally in a local storage device of the information processing apparatus, prior to retrieving the certificate. As noted previously, *Bianco* always requests a template from a remote server. The Examiner cites to *Bianco* 16:7-9 and alleges that this cited passage supports that *Bianco* first determines whether a certificate has been received before requesting it. Applicants disagree. *Bianco* 16:4-19 states,

At this point, as shown in FIG. 4F, there is two-way communication between the client and the server (i.e., between the two piers) through comm object 408 and comm object 310. Init object 406 knows which receiver object needs to be created by the client (i.e., receiving pier) to preform [sic] the specific task required. Therefore, once this communication is established, init object 406 sends a request to the client (i.e., receiving pier) to create the specific receiver object. In FIG. 4G, switchboard object 402 receives the request, via comm object 410, and creates the receiver object 412. Once receiver object 412 is created, comm object 410 is relocated to receiver object 412 in FIG. 4H. Now, as shown in FIG. 4I, init object 406 and receiver object 412, via comm object 408 and comm object 410, can communicate back and forth until receiver object 412 completes the task requested by init object 406. (emphasis added)

The Examiner alleges that *Bianco's* receiver object 412 anticipates Applicants' claimed person identification certificate. It is clear from this cited passage that this is incorrect. *Bianco's* receiver object is clearly not a certificate, but is instead an object that is instantiated to receive communications via a comm object 410. This is clearly unrelated to a person identification certificate.

Even if one would assume that *Bianco's* receiver object 412 is a person identification certificate, which it clearly is not, nowhere does *Bianco* teach or suggest determining whether a person authentication certificate has been received and stored locally in local storage, prior to retrieving the certificate. For example, the passage *Bianco* 16:7-9 cited by the Examiner, merely states that *Bianco* knows which receiver object needs to be created and then asks the client to create the object. This is unrelated to making a determination of whether something is stored locally. This subject matter is simply not recited in *Bianco*. Further, this subject matter is clearly not inherent in *Bianco*, because it is not necessarily present. *Bianco* does not necessarily need to determine whether a certificate is stored locally in order to know which certificate to order. For example, *Bianco* may know which certificate to request based on a number of factors, such as based on a desired task.

Thus, for at least this reason, *Bianco* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 12, 22, and 27.

Claims 2-11, 13-21, and 23-26 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 12, 22, and 27 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 12, 22, and 27 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-27 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher P. Rauch/ (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHNEIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)